



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2006 Minutes

The regularly scheduled meeting of the Special Studies Committee met at 6:00 PM on September 5, 2006 in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana.

Members in attendance: Leo Dierckman, Mark Rattermann, Steve Stromquist, Madeleine Torres, and Susan Westermeier, thereby constituting a quorum.

Matt Griffin and David Littlejohn attended the meeting on behalf of The Department of Community Services.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

**1. Docket No. 06060007 ADLS Amend: Manor Care at Summer Trace – Signage
CONT TO OCT 3**

The applicant seeks approval for a two new signs.

The site is located at 12999 Pennsylvania St and is zoned OM/MF.

Filed by Brandon Reinoehl for Site Enhancement Services, Inc.

2. Docket No. 06060018 DP Amend: Village Center/Peripheral Retail-VOWC

The applicant seeks to modify the existing site plan and Development Requirements for the Village of West Clay—Village Center and Peripheral Retail Area.

The site is located at Towne Road and 131st Street, and is zoned PUD.

Filed by Keith Lash of Brenwick TND Communities, LLC.

Present for petitioner: George Sweet and Keith Lash, Brenwick Development. The petitioner is requesting three modifications to the development requirements for the Village of WestClay PUD Ordinance. The modifications were presented at public hearing on August 15, 2006 before the Plan Commission.

The first modification relates to detached, single family housing in the Village Center—the core of the community. Currently, the single-family dwellings within the Village Center are bound

by the primary area building guidelines. The primary area extends to 131st Street and Towne Road. The petitioner is requesting a separate lot category—single-family, detached homes—in the Village Center core.

The second modification relates to swapping the senior housing and four retail area parcels. The request is to relocate two, four-unit buildings that were approved in the initial design in 2004. The buildings would be located more into the middle of the development, closer to the multi-story building. This alteration is on the basis of a request from the senior housing developers in an attempt to get the 8 units closer to the mass building where all of the services are located. This particular request does not alter the number of units in the senior housing or the square footage of retail permitted west of Towne Road.

The third modification relates to the maximum letter height of signage in the peripheral retail area—the area of retail west of Towne Road approved in 2004. Currently, the PUD Ordinance caps the maximum letter height up to 12 inches and limits signage on buildings to 45 square feet. This particular request is to eliminate the letter height requirement and going to a square footage limit that would be in keeping with Carmel's Ordinance. The Village of WestClay imposed the limit on itself in an attempt to make the design of the signage an architectural statement an element of the buildings. Under the PUD guidelines, the signage takes away from the architecture of the building—a 12-inch letter height does not fill out the sign board on the building and detracts from the statement of the architecture.

Regarding the maximum height of the Village Center, single-family detached dwellings, the request is to create a separate lot category for the Village Center and in doing so, the maximum height of residential units is increased from 30 feet to 50 feet, only in the core of the development. 50 feet was not an arbitrary number; currently the Village of WestClay PUD Ordinance permits commercial, multi-family, condominium buildings, and mixed-use buildings to be built to a height of 50 feet in the Village Center. Brenwick is asking that a designer of a single-family detached dwelling be allowed the opportunity to build a building in keeping with the mass of other buildings in the vicinity in the Village Center to keep the streetscape. The building height in the Village Center is not being raised—they are currently permitted to be 50 feet in keeping with the streetscape.

Another comment at public hearing was regarding the swapping of the senior housing in the peripheral retail area. The senior housing along Towne Road was a requirement or request of the City Council in its review of the project. Keith Lash circulated site plans from 2004; the senior housing is not along Towne Road at its northern edge—there is a commercial building on that corner. Between October 7 and October 26th, some of the senior housing buildings were relocated to the north. The reason for the change is that the developer of the senior housing project came back to Brenwick and asked to only build 40 units—two of the buildings were eliminated. In doing that, Brenwick elected to move two of the buildings to the north, hence the October 26th site plan. The November 3rd site plan as it relates to the commercial and senior housing is very similar; the main difference between the two site plans was a lengthy debate on density and the townhomes were taken off the plan. The November 3rd plan was subsequently approved on

November 9th by the Special Studies Committee, November 16th by the Plan Commission, and February 7, 2005 by the City Council without any changes.

Subsequent to the 2005 zoning approval, the senior housing developer asked if they could relocate the two northern-most buildings to the west, bringing them closer to the main building from a site design standpoint.

The third comment at public hearing related to the peripheral retail area signage. The 12-inch letter height was a requirement through the process by the City—implied by the City Council. The sign section of the PUD refers to the maximum letter height is twelve inches—as filed by Brenwick and was self-imposed.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: There is no issue with the urban core area of the Village and the Department is in full support. The petitioner has given correct information in the way the PUD is structured; technically speaking, the Department sees no real issues. From the Department's perspective, the petitioner's request meets the PUD.

Leo Dierckman referred to a letter received this day from Councilman Rick Sharp objecting to switching the properties and the signage.

George Sweet was given a copy of Rick Sharp's letter. The change is not that important; however, it makes sense for the safety of the older people to be closer to the main building. The two buildings on the north/south street should be an allowed use so the development plan should change that. Should the Committee decide this not be done, OK, we will either deal with it later or put a use on there that is allowed currently.

As to the sign, we started out not wanting huge sign-boards in the Village; we had six inch letters. It was modified in 2004 to 10 inch letters. The ten inch letters do not look right and it is also not practical because the buildings are so much farther away from the street and the sign is hard to read.

Dee Fox, Royal Court, Carmel stated that the three modifications being requested were denied by the City Council. The signage is inappropriate; if it is neighborhood serving commercial—everyone will know what those buildings are. The most important issue to the public is swapping the senior housing with commercial. The public is adamant about keeping commercial development off of Towne Road. As far as the building height, 50 feet is OK for commercial, but for residential that can be a 5-story building, again, unacceptable.

Leo Dierckman noted that not one person living within this development has been vocal; they seem to be pleased and happy to be living within the project. It has only been persons on the external that have been vocal. The most people impacted by a height issue on residential versus commercial would be those persons immediately adjacent to the property. However, the signage on Towne Road does impact the peripheral people.

George Sweet agreed that minimal signage on Towne Road is appropriate—only one tenant sign would be exposed to Towne Road—there would be no multiple signs.

Mark Rattermann said he had no real problem with the modifications—the signage was the only issue.

Leo Dierckman asked if George Sweet was willing to withdraw the request for the commercial.

George Sweet said he could, but did not know what path he would be walking down.

Mark Rattermann felt that from a land-planning standpoint, wouldn't we definitely not want residential? Putting the commercial on Towne and the residential farther back seems like a better fit from a land-planning standpoint.

Keith Lash also noted that there is a dense buffer yard requirement along the frontage of Towne Road—there would be significant screening, no bare wall exposure to Towne Road.

Susan Westermeier commented that there are a number of people that live on the west side that are concerned about the modifications. If there were commitments made that there would be no commercial on Towne....

Mark Rattermann noted that commercial is already there—that commitment was never made. The argument was – “are we getting a CVS, or Steak ‘N Shake,” and drive-up windows were an issue. The placement of this commercial was not the argument. Commercial on Towne will come up again because the Guerrero property is still out there.

Matt Griffin said there was not a whole lot of ground along Towne Road to commercialize at this point.

Keith Lash said that one of the permitted uses for that corner in the primary area is a civic use—an on-site parking lot. We could honestly be talking about the commercial building sitting not up on Towne Road but back 150 feet, and between the building and Towne Road could be a parking lot, or it could be multi-family townhomes, single family. There is always an opportunity that the commercial could face Towne Road, maybe not as close.

Madeleine Torres commented that she, too, lives on the west side and believes that the Village of WestClay is an asset to the west side of Carmel and provides commercial—a gas station would even be good.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to recommend approval to the full Commission of **Docket No. 06060018 DP Amend: Village Center/Peripheral Retail-VOWC, amended** to limit the size increase of the signage facing Towne Road at 12 inches—Carmel Sign Ordinance on the balance, seconded by Madeleine Torres, approved 5-0.

3. Docket No. 06070007 DP/ADLS: 122nd & Penn Development.

The applicant seeks to construct two, 3-story office buildings, out of three proposed buildings total, on a 27.41-acre office park.

The site is located at the northeast corner of 122nd Street and Pennsylvania Street, and is currently zoned R1 and M3, with a B3 rezone request pending.

Filed by Paul Reis of Bose McKinney & Evans, LLP for Panattoni Development, LLC

Paul Reis, attorney with Bose McKinney & Evans appeared before the Committee. Also in attendance: Fred Simmons, architect; Mary Zerbach and Nathan McClure, Panattoni; Dan Gertam and Craig Forge, American Consulting Engineers.

The project has undergone a number of changes from the time it was first filed. The Engineering Department has said that basically, all of the major access issues and site design issues have been addressed. There may be some minor issues with drainage to be addressed with ACE, but those issues would not affect the site plan.

Fred Simmons, Simmons Architects, LLC addressed the Committee. The revised site plan reflects the winding road into the center of the property, a larger detention basin to the north and the smaller to the south of the primary drive. The ponds will also handle the run-off from the eight (8) acres that Panattoni owns immediately west of the site. Most all of the comments have been addressed in terms of the site plan. Building #2 has been pushed to the north by about 40-50 feet from the last plan submitted.

Bio-swales have also been included in the large landscape areas to comply with LEEDS requirements and the request of the Department. At this time, the petitioner is not requesting any signage and will return at a later date. Photo-metrics for the lighting are included in the revision. Bicycle parking is now shown on the detailed site plan. There is a sidewalk shown on the south side of the main entry drive; Staff has requested a second walkway. A second walkway has not been done because the area is used as bio-swales—the site is also properly connected to all buildings and to both 122nd and Pennsylvania Streets. A comment was made regarding a pathway around the ponds—the petitioner would be more than happy to do that, but would prefer to utilize mulch from an environmental standpoint.

There are three picnic areas, again a LEEDS consideration as well as an amenity to the park, and those will be constructed when the buildings are completed. The ADLS portion of this review only relates to buildings 2 and 3—the other building is still subject to re-design.

Fred Simmons referred to comments that the entry was not inviting and that the use of the sloped, “glazing” element at the main entry was “trendy.” In response to those comments, the entryway has been enlarged, (doubled) the sloped “glazing” has been done away with, and some of the more architectural treatments were added to the front of the building—the west elevation, as well as the east elevation at the entry and the north elevation at the entry.

Panattoni does appreciate and understand the green design initiative; however, at this point in time, Panattoni is not seeking “LEEDS” certification. Panattoni is implementing many LEEDS

sustainable design elements within the project and will make every effort to incorporate as many of the items as possible.

Regarding building materials, two buildings will be compatible relative to the glass color, the aluminum window framing, etc. Around the main entry on both the front and back will be terra cotta tile.

Paul Reis referred to comments from Scott Brewer. Scott is suggesting more shade trees from an energy conservation standpoint and the petitioner will comply. All of the engineering issues have been addressed. There is sufficient right-of-way provided that will accommodate a round about. The conceptual design and location are still being worked on, but the site plan would not change based upon the round about.

There was some discussion regarding access to the adjacent sites. To the east are warehouses along Hancock Street and a comment was made to do a possible access between two buildings. The concern would be creating an easement for substantially different uses.

Fred Simmons asked that this item not be continued at the Committee level. The petitioner believes he has addressed all of the substantial issues to the best of their ability. The owner has made a commitment to a tenant to have the building finished and occupied by September first, 2007. Because of the way this is being constructed, an additional 30 days would put a burden on the applicant. Unless there are considerable issues to be addressed, the petitioner would prefer a recommending vote this evening.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: Any time there are outstanding issues, the Department does not recommend an item be “moved on.” If there is a comfort level that can be resolved with the few remaining, small issues, the Department does not have a problem forwarding this item. Regarding those few remaining issues: a detail should be submitted showing the plazas and what they will contain—outdoor seating, or shelters, etc. There should also be some sort of pedestrian connection into the plazas so that they can be utilized to traverse the site, perhaps mulch paths into the network to get people around the ponds. In terms of the internal path of the sidewalks, the Department would like to see it double, but there is no requirement.

Regarding an access easement to the east to align between the two existing warehouse buildings, Matt Griffin will check with Engineering Dept—if they do not feel this is a valid access point, the Department has no problem with that.

Most of Scott Brewer’s comments on the landscape plan were species related. Scott will want to see details on the bio-swales.

If all requested items are provided, the Department will recommend that this item be forwarded to the full Commission with a positive recommendation.

Susan Westermeier commented that she would like more information regarding the bio-swales at the full Commission meeting.

Fred Simmons offered to meet with Carol Schleif to go over some of the architectural details.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to recommend approval of **Docket No. 06070007 DP/ADLS, 122nd and Penn Development**, subject to Matt Griffin's approval of the bio-swales, submission of details on the bio-swales, and pedestrian paths, seconded by Steve Stromquist, approved 5-0.

4. Docket No. 06070019 ADLS Amend: Sky Bank – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for two new signs.

The site is located at 3675 W 106th St and is zoned B-5.

Filed by Tony George for the Sign Craft Industries.

Amanda Gates, project manager for Sign Craft Industries appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Andrew McCleeney, Sign Craft Industries.

The petitioner is amending his initial request for signs from two to one sign on the building. The original signage is currently located on the north elevation. The proposal provides for removal of the sign on the north elevation and places Sky Bank signage on the west elevation, the front façade of the building.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The petitioner is taking down two signs and putting up one sign. An outstanding issue with this particular site is that when Union Federal Bank initially came through the process, their Development Plan included a recreation path, however, the path was never installed. The Department is seeking written commitment that the petitioner will install the recreation path.

Christopher Hoarsley, Hokanson Companies property manager said the previous set of plans shows the walking path. Karyn Ryg with Carmel Alternative Transportation is in process of determining whose responsibility that is, whether it is the initial developer or Union Federal Bank.

Matt Griffin responded that it is the current landowner's responsibility.

There was discussion regarding the path and the installation—the commitment was made to install the path at the time the initial Development Plan Approval was granted.

Leo felt that this is one of those instances where the petitioner needs the sign, and the City needs the path.

Mark Rattermann felt that the Committee could do one of two things: Either deny the sign which will then make someone else pay or the petitioner will get a court order making the City approve this because it is not related OR, approve it and then the City would sue for the completion of the path.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06070019 ADLS Amend, Sky Bank Signage**, conditioned upon an escrowed dollar amount 100% equal to a bid for constructing the path in question, said bid must be approved by the Engineering Department, seconded by Susand Westermeier, Approved 5-0.

5. Docket No. 06080029 ADLS Amend: Public Storage – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall and ground sign.

The site is located at 1099 Range Line Rd and is zoned B-3.

Filed by Amanda Gates for Sign Craft Industries.

Amanda Gates, Sign Craft Industries, appeared before the Committee requesting permission to remove the existing fascia of the Shurguard sign and install replacement faces for public storage. The hardware will be painted as well as the poles. The wall sign face would be removed and the Shurguard Storage would be replaced with a public storage space.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: Both signs comply with the Ordinance; they are merely re-facing the existing signage. The Department recommends approval.

There is limited landscaping around the sign—officially they would be required to have a landscape bed around the sign.

Steve Stromquist made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080029 ADLS Amend, Public Storage – Signage**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, Approved 4 in favor, one opposed (Dierckman.)

6. Docket No. 06080006 ADLS Amend: Opus Landmark @ Meridian Phase II

The applicant seeks approval for the construction of a 124,215-square foot, four-story office building in an existing office park.

The site is located at 10333 North Meridian Street and is zoned B2.

Filed by Steve Foster of Opus North.

CONTINUED to October 3, 2006

7. Docket No. 06050001 Z: Legacy/East Carmel PUD Rezone

The applicant seeks to rezone 509.234 acres from S-1 to Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a primarily residential, mixed-use development.

The site is located north of 126th Street, south of 146th Street, and on either side of River Road. Filed by Steve Pittman and Paul Rioux of Pittman Properties.

Note: Heard last, out of sequence.

Charlie Frankenberger, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Paul Rioux and Steve Pittman.

Charlie gave a quick overview of the progress to-date. A lot of positive changes have been

s:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committee/SpecialStudies/2006sept05

made—the large lot area in the northwest corner has been made less isolated and more connected to trails. Character exhibits with mid-century, commercial architecture have been included. The number and location of drive-thru's have been limited. Written, architectural standards have been included. The development standards have been re-located out of the Ordinance into an exhibit. Granny Flats are permitted and referred to in the Ordinance as “Accessory Dwellings.” The procedural provisions have been revised to require ADLS/DP of everything except detached, single-family.

In addition, a large change was made. Originally, the Ordinance as proposed had separate and distinct use pockets. It was thought that the Ordinance should permit a better blend of uses. We went from a fixed land plan and fixed Ordinance to a very flexible Ordinance. It was the very flexible Ordinance that was discussed at the last Committee meeting and it was determined then that we had made it too flexible. We were asked to confer with the Department in an effort to strike a better balance between predictability and flexibility. We meet with the Department and received a lot of good suggestions. Tonight, we want to discuss those with the Committee, conceptually, receive input and for the next Committee in October, we would revise the text of the PUD to correspond to the revised vision for this land plan.

Paul Rioux then addressed the Committee. Pittman Partners started off with the idea that they had a pretty determined plan, shown the first time, waived back to a open, three phase concept where there was open space, mixed-use and residential. Most of the site plan being shown does not require the degree of flexibility that would allow an Ordinance that is wide open.

The roadway that comes through and connects to Hazel Dell Parkway is laid out in concert with the Thoroughfare Plan. In addition, it makes its way through some poor soil areas so that it can be built with the problems that they had with 146th Street. The roadway that runs west to east is relatively fixed—it will move a few feet, but not across the site. North of The Legacy, the Pedcor apartment community is being constructed and the road will align at their entrance to give The Legacy a north/south road. There are some soils that are unsuitable for construction; so, there will be some natural open spaces, prairie restoration, etc., but it starts to define what we can do with the site. We have made commitments to the neighbors that the area north of the ridge and west would all be large lot, single-family homes.

There have been some minor changes. There is a connection to Haverstick that was requested—there is a stub street there today. One of those two entry points onto the boulevard will be done away with so that traffic can be minimized.

The single family area is another area that does not have a large degree of flexibility. A retirement community, a church, school, civic use, accessory uses are allowed. There has been some conversation that perhaps the school could use a little more land, also maybe a 50-70 foot buffer that could be incorporated into the property. We are not looking for a tremendous amount of flexibility there. That pretty much leaves us with the core or village area. When we talk flexibility, this is generally the area referred to in the Ordinance.

To summarize, we have come back from “total flexibility” to some flexibility of the language

and allowing most to stay as planned in the initial presentation.

A plan has now been created for the open space and this is pretty much an on-going process with the Department, Earlham, and Connor Prairie.

Charlie Frankenberger commented that the agreement that governs is clear that they take title eventually from Earlham, subject to the zoning restrictions that will be specified in black and white in the PUD. Right now, the Deed to the land on the east side of River Road is held in escrow from Earlham College to Connor Prairie. The Deed will be conveyed when the closing of the sale of Earlham to this applicant (Legacy) occurs. The reason it is held in escrow until after the zoning is so that everyone is sure that it is conveyed subject to the zoning restrictions. Per the escrow agreement, the zoning restrictions are literally attached to the deed as restrictions. The zoning occurs, the deed restrictions are defined that are attached as an exhibit to the Deed, and the Deed gets conveyed out of escrow. That way, we are assured that they take subject to the zoning restrictions that are literally deed restrictions in the deed.

Leo Dierckman said that the CCRC and Granny Flats should be included in the overall density.

Mark Rattermann asked if there were any kind of written commitment from the school. Mark wanted to hear that another elementary school would not have to be constructed because of this development. This is a primary concern.

Steve Pittman was certain that such a commitment could be produced. The school is not concerned about the elementary school level—they have plenty of capacity left. Because of Gramercy and the Legacy proposal, the school is going to up-date a new study.

Madeleine Torres commented that the school is very reactionary and for us to think that they would be pro-active, it would be a shock.

Mark Rattermann said that this is a PUD and we can impose restrictions or not. We can tell the developer we want patio homes...we really need to force the school system to look at this.

Steve Pittman said the school has actually looked at this development and the petitioner has met with Dr. Underwood and their facilities planner. Steve Dillon is up-dating their report.

Leo Dierckman commented that there is not that much land on the east side to be developed. Prairie Trace already handles all of the kids east of Hazel Dell. You can literally look at Cherry Tree—kids were shifted to Prairie Trace to increase the enrollment.

Steve Pittman said that when they met with the school, they were actually encouraged to incorporate more family-type housing; however, that is not what we are hearing from the City.

Mark Rattermann asked that language be put in the text that this is preliminary so that it could change and morph.

Leo Dierckman said that this is such a big project, we would rather not have to do this on a regularly scheduled Committee evening. It would be better to go over this in a special meeting. Conceptually, it is a good project.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: This is a huge project and it will take some time. It seems as if we are pretty much on the same page now, although the deliverable has not yet been seen. The Department made a laundry list of things we want to see the petitioner commit to physically. The Department would like to see street layout, pedestrian plan, open space plan, environmental systems plan, and “use blocks.” The use blocks will be defined in detail in the PUD Ordinance. Our concerns at this point, legally, as you read through the PUD, it is pretty circular and a lot of holes in it. We are really trying to tighten this up. In terms of the mixed-use component, the Department is concerned that the retail node would bleed up to 146th Street and become retail on 146th with residential behind it. While there is limited retail on 146th Street, it is easy for retail to pull you into the core of this development. We want to see a flex of uses, but caution that the flex should not open the door to 146th Street and not the core. The Department is going to submit a first attempt at a “red-line” to the petitioner. At some point, we need to sit down to go over the PUD line-by-line, just as we did with Gramercy.

Legacy/East Carmel PUD Rezone was continued to October 3, 2006.

8. Docket No. 06080013 ADLS Coastal Corporate Center – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new sign package.

The site is located at 10439 Commerce Dr and is zoned B-5.

Filed by Doug Staley Jr. from Staley Signs.

Doug Staley, Jr. appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. The buildings are garden-style, professional offices, four-sided architecture. In this particular phase of the project, there are four building that front Commerce Drive. The buildings will be divided up into a variety of ways; therefore, a little flexibility is required in how the tenant signage is done.

The tenant signage is in the small, EFIS sign band area—no sign will be located outside of those areas. The petitioner is proposing ten-inch tall letters, painted black, one-quarter inch thick routed aluminum—a heavy weight, individually cut, non-illuminated letter that would mount on the space. It is more a location-type sign for people looking for a doctor, dentist, whoever might be in the space, but not a huge, advertising type of sign.

The petitioner has set a maximum letter height of 10 inches but will stick to the Carmel Sign Ordinance of 30 square feet. If there were a list of attorneys with 4 or 5 names, one tenant could possibly utilize 20 to 30 square feet. All signs would mount on the west elevation of the building; this complies with the Carmel Ordinance to make certain that every sign is a street frontage, Commerce Drive. There will be no signs on the rear of the building.

The address sign is 2 X 4 feet, a significant portion is the address with very small, two inch aluminum slats that identify the tenant in a particular entry; that sign would be on both sides.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The sign package complies with the Ordinance.

Susan Westermeier made formal motion to approve Docket No. 06080013 ADLS Coastal Corporate Center – Signage as presented, seconded by Madeleine Torres, APPROVED 5-0.

9. Docket No. 06080016 ADLS Amend: The Centre CVS – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall sign.

The site is located at 1390 S Range Line Rd.

Filed by Nancy Long for A-1 Expeditors.

Nancy Long, A-1 Expeditors, appeared before the Committee. Currently there is a banner that replaces the former Osco Drug sign. The previous sign was 4 feet high; the petitioner is requesting two feet high. The total square footage is 33, the height is 16 feet, 8 ½ inches. The sign being requested is smaller than the previous existing sign.

CVS purchased Osco Drug; hence the necessity for the change in sign.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The Department is recommending approval.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080016 ADLS Amend: The Centre CVS – Signage**, seconded by Madeleine Torres, APPROVED 5-0.

10. Docket No. 06080017 ADLS Amend: Ingersoll Rand – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall and ground sign.

The site is located at 11835 Pennsylvania Rd and is zoned B-2.

Filed by Craig Carpenter for Atlas Sign Company.

Craig Carpenter with Atlas Sign Company appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Permission is being requested to remove the Conesco signage and install the Ingersoll Rand logo and monument sign, almost in the same location as the previously existing sign. The Conesco sign was not lit—the Ingersoll Rand sign will be halo lit.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The petitioner is merely replacing a permitted, existing sign and the Department is recommending approval.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080017 ADLS Amend: Ingersoll Rand – Signage**, seconded by Susan Westermeier, APPROVED 5-0.

11. Docket No. 06080019 ADLS Amend: Club Canine – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall sign.

The site is located at 457 3rd Ave SW and is zoned I-1.

Filed by Kera Slowitsky for Club Canine LLC.

Kera Slowitsky's mother appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. A rendering of the sign logo was displayed. The business opened today.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: The sign complies with the Ordinance and the Department is recommending approval.

Susan Westermeier made formal motion to approve Docket No. 06080019 ADLS Amend: Club Canine – Signage, seconded by Steve Stromquist, APPROVED 5-0.

12. Docket No. 06080020 ADLS Amend: Parkwood Crossing Cingular Wireless – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for a new wall sign.

The site is located at 900 E 96th St and is zoned PUD

Filed by Blaine Paul for Duke Realty Limited Partnership.

Aaron Reynolds, Duke Realty Corp. appeared before the Committee. Also in attendance was Rick Trempe, Vice President of the Indianapolis office group.

The ADLS Amend petition is requesting a change of the original sign location for the Parkwood IX Building. The new, proposed location is just above where the original location was proposed. Photographs of existing signage on the building were circulated.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn. The sign required a variance and that has already been granted by the BZA for square footage. Since the petitioner is just moving the sign, the Department is recommending approval.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080020 ADLS Amend: Parkwood Crossing Cingular Wireless – Signage**, seconded by Steve Stromquist, **APPROVED 5-0.**

**13. Docket No. 06080028 ADLS Amend: Carmel Woods – Signage
CONT. TO OCT. 3**

The applicant seeks approval for a new ground sign.

The site is located 1010 Clubhouse Ct. and is zoned B-3.

Filed by Thomas Langdon from Quilfire Sign and Graphic Inc.

14. Docket No. 06080031 ADLS Amend: Ed Martin – Signage

The applicant seeks approval for an additional wall sign and a change to the existing ground sign.

The site is located at 9896 N Michigan Rd and is zoned I-1.

Filed by Thomas Ely, Jr. for The Sign Group, Inc.

Tom Ely with The Sign Group appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. The Buick franchise is newly acquired and the petitioner is seeking permission to put a Buick logo matching the other logos on the building. Everything on the sign will stay the same except the addition of the Buick logo.

The ground sign currently has a Pontiac logo and a GMC logo. The petitioner simply wants to add Buick—it would be the same size, proportional to the others. The Pontiac logo will be moved so that they will center, side-by-side.

Department Comments, David Littlejohn: When this item initially came through, the petitioner considered the two logos as separate signs, a total of three signs on frontage; adding this particular logo would bring it to a total of 4 signs. The Department is recommending approval contingent upon the approval of a variance from the BZA.

Steve Stromquist made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080031 ADLS Amend: Ed Martin – Signage, conditioned upon** approval of a variance from the BZA, seconded by Madeleine Torres, **APPROVED 5-0.**

15. Docket No. 06080033 ADLS Amend: Hunter’s Quest – Lighting, Landscaping, and Signage

The applicant seeks approval for alterations to the landscaping, lighting, and signage. The site is located at 104 E. Carmel Drive and is zoned B8 within the Range Line Road / Carmel Drive Overlay.

Filed by David Fineberg for the Fineberg Group, LLC.

David Fineberg appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Mark Fineberg with the Fineberg Group. The petitioner is seeking permission to change the existing Development Plan in terms of the width of the signs on the wall. The signs are currently 15 feet per 20 feet of frontage. The petitioner is requesting an amendment to reflect the current Ordinance and the sign chart under the B-8 zoning. Some type of goose-neck, small, down-lighting is also being requested; these can be run off the existing electrical.

Additional landscaping is being done that consists of re-working the existing two planters at the front of the building. A six-foot ground sign is also being requested—this is a multi-tenant building. The ground sign would replace the existing pylon sign at the same location.

Department Comments, Matt Griffin: The request for the wall sign size is supported by the Department, however, we would like to see the petitioner commit to color, style, and selection.

Mr. Fineberg stated that initially in 1976 the color was gold—it is now maroon and the petitioner would like to keep it that way.

The petitioner would like to change the existing development plan in terms of the width of the signs on the wall; the amendment would comply with the current ordinance. The petitioner would also like to add some small can and gooseneck lighting.

Matt Griffin further commented that there are no concerns with wall sign lighting. The Department Report asks that the signs would only be illuminated during business hours; however, looking at the context of the area, most of the retail signs that are illuminated are dimmed at night. If they are on at night, the Department does not have a problem with that.

Landscape Planters: Scott Brewer's comments on the species selection have not been forthcoming. However, the Department is OK with the swap.

The petitioner said he had hired a landscape designer to do the planters. However, the petitioner was willing to work with Scott Brewer.

Matt Griffin referred to the Department Report. As mentioned, a variance will be required for the ground sign—no longer permitted under the Carmel Drive/Range Line Road Overlay. The Department does support the sign variance.

Matt Griffin noted that the ground sign would require a variance and staff would support the variance and losing the pylon sign is an aesthetic plus.

Mark Rattermann made formal motion to approve **Docket No. 06080033 ADLS Amend: Hunter's Quest – Lighting, Landscaping, and Signage, subject to** Scott Brewer's approval of the species in the landscape planters and the commitment to stay with Maroon lettering and the approval of a variance for the ground sign, seconded by Madeleine Torres, **APPROVED 5-0**.

The meeting adjourned at 8:43 PM.

Leo Dierckman, Chairperson

Ramona Hancock, Secretary